

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this patent application, of which claims 1 and 15 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully request a reconsideration and allowance of this patent application in view of the following remarks.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 2, and 15-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over U. S. Patent No. 4,485,379 issued to Kinoshita, *et al.* (“Kinoshita”) in view of U. S. Patent No. 6,265,833 issued to Kim, *et al.* (“Kim”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the reference or references, when combined, must disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations. The motivation to modify the prior art and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art and not based upon a patent applicant’s disclosure. *See in re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The initial burden is on the examiner to provide some suggestion of the desirability of doing what the inventor has done. “To support the conclusion that the claimed invention is directed to obvious subject matter, either the references must expressly or impliedly suggest the claimed invention or the examiner must present a convincing line of reasoning as to why the artisan would have found the claimed invention to have been obvious in light of the teachings of the references.” *Ex parte Clapp*, 227 USPQ 972, 973 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1985).

The examiner has failed to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness. In the office action, the examiner noted that “Kim/Kinoshita does not teach the same control circuit that also outputs a scan control signal based on the image signal to be displayed and said selected mode ...” Yet, the examiner summarily concludes that “...it would have been obvious to conveniently add a scan control signal output to Kim’s controller 3 so that both data control and scan control would come from a same circuit.”

There is no suggestion or motivation to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Nor is there a showing of a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, even combining the references does not disclose or suggest all of the claim limitations.

Specifically, claims 1 and 15 recite, *inter alia*:

a control circuit which selects one of modes as an operation mode
in response to a mode switching signal, and outputs a data signal and a
scan control signal based on an image signal to be displayed and said
selected mode

As the examiner noted, Kim’s controller does not teach outputting a scan signal or outputting a scan signal depending upon a mode of operation. Rather, Kim’s controller outputs a driving signal based on a signal from an optical signal converter. Further, Kinoshita merely teaches line-by-line scanning.

Therefore, combining Kim’s controller with Kinoshita’s scanning signal does not show the control circuit of Applicant’s invention. Neither Kim nor Kinoshita disclose or suggest varying panel brightness or saving power by varying the means of scanning the panel. Therefore, Kim/Kinoshita teach and suggest concepts that are fundamentally different than Applicant’s invention. And the structure and function of Applicants’ invention is fundamentally

different and patentably distinct from the cited references. None of the other references of record supply the deficiencies of Kim/Kinoshita. Therefore, claim 15 is patentable.

Claim 1 was rejected under a similar analysis to claim 15. For the reasons noted above, claim 1 is also patentable.

Claims 2 and 16-18 depend from claim 1, which is an allowable claim. Hence, claims 2 and 16-18 are also allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2 and 16-18 are patentable over the references of record.

Since the none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom, are allowable.

Claims 3-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Kinoshita and Kim, in view of Kuwata, *et al.* (“Kuwata”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claims 3-14 depend from claim 1, which is an allowable claim. The additional reference of Kuwata does not cure the deficiency of Kinoshita and Kim. Hence, claims 3-14 are also allowable.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-18. Since the none of the other prior art of record, whether taken alone or in any combination, discloses or suggests all the features of the claimed invention, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 15, and all the claims that depend therefrom are allowable.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the pending Office Action and respectfully submits that all of the stated objections and grounds for rejection have been overcome or rendered moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that all pending claims are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative at the number below to expedite prosecution.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Hae-Chan Park
Reg. No. 50,114

Date: September 22, 2004

McGuireWoods LLP
1750 Tysons Boulevard
Suite 1800
McLean, VA 22102-4215
Tel: 703-712-5365
Fax: 703-712-5280
HCP:RTS/bjb

\COM\433789.2